

RAMONA HOUSING WORKSHOPS

December 6, 2004- Workshop Notes

Background

On December 6, 2004, the County of San Diego hosted a public workshop in Ramona. The meeting was to be the first in a short series of workshops focused on addressing future housing issues in Ramona, including:

- The community's desire to create design standards for housing (Ramona Village Visioning Workshops, 2003-2004);
- The community's expressed interest in mixed-use (Ramona Village Visioning Workshops, 2003-2004);
- The County of San Diego's requirement to meet state-mandated affordable housing requirements (based solely on allowable residential density).

The workshop was held from 7-9pm at Ramona Elementary School. Approximately thirty-three community stakeholders attended the meeting (*see attached sign-in sheet*).

Process

County staff presented anticipated state housing requirements, which have not yet been fully determined for the County of San Diego or for the community of Ramona. The County plans to seek special exceptions to some of the anticipated state requirements. Staff will have more specific information on the amount and nature of non-single family housing types that will be required (by density) upon response from the state (see presentation at:

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/cnty/cntydepts/landuse/planning/GP2020/pubs/pdfs/hsgpres.pdf>).

At the suggestion of community members, independent Planning consultant, Michael Young of the Stepner Design Group, was invited to facilitate the workshop. Mr. Young engaged with the community in a discussion of community interests and concerns regarding the citizens' interest in and concerns about additional non-single-family housing and mixed use. While the dialogue was focused on issues directly related to the provision of housing, community members commented on a range of topics with varying degrees of relevance to this issue. Citizen comments were documented on a large flip chart. Statements included on the Flip Chart comments listed below (Figure A).

Outcomes

The community members expressed a desire to create design standards versus retaining existing design guidelines. This topic was to be discussed in more detail at the next workshop. They also stated concerns about the capacity of local infrastructure to support existing and future populations. The next workshop was also established as an opportunity at which information would be provided regarding the planning processes whereby these concerns could be addressed most effectively.

Decisions were not made regarding the appropriateness of mixed use or of greater allowable building heights in the community. County staff clarified that the County *does not* have a mandate to implement mixed use or to allow for three-story buildings in the community. These are opportunities available *if* the community chooses to utilize them. One exception is that three-story allowances in limited locations off of Main Street could be required if state housing mandates remain inflexible. The County is taking steps to request exceptions from more stringent State regulations.

Figure A- 12/06/04 FLIP CHART COMMENTS

- ✓ Growth is Inevitable (state mandate)
- ✓ Estimated 246 non-single-family units (?)
- ✓ State Housing Element Requirements
- ✓ Don't push traffic down to two lanes
- ✓ Government...
- ✓ Are we "building the roof" first?
- ✓ Lack of streets and other infrastructure
- ✓ Problem of growth
- ✓ Too much for Ramona
- ✓ Suspicions borne of past performance
- ✓ 26+ mtgs...(?)
- ✓ Mixed use is problematic in Ramona
- ✓ "Old Town"/ "New Town"- Unified Architecture
- ✓ Restrict height to maintain character
- ✓ Need for infrastructure
- ✓ Have new higher density fit into character
- ✓ Mixed use is not what Ramona has thus far experienced
- ✓ Improve Guidelines
- ✓ 3 Story? (Out of character)
- ✓ High density?
- ✓ Secondary units, "granny flats"
- ✓ Have specific pictures that are examples
- ✓ Ramona-specific zoning regs.
- ✓ Minimum standards all along Main- include non-historic
- ✓ You can say "Yes" OR "No" to:
 - Mixed-use
 - 3-story, etc...
- ✓ Change guidelines to STANDARDS
- ✓ Ramona- Can Planning Group say "yes" or "no"...YES
- ✓ 20 yrs. ago former County planning efforts- "Office Professional" did *not* work
- ✓ Count secondary units throughout Planning Area (state won't allow)
- ✓ Existing Office/ Professional still there.
- ✓ A.D.A. regulations require elevators @ 2-story except if you have residential. 3-story need not be bad.
- ✓ "D" Street might be a good candidate
- ✓ Employ special use/ variances to address extraordinary (atypical) projects
- ✓ Take control of process
- ✓ Additional units mean additional electric and water- Where?
- ✓ Can't stop growth BUT.....we can control it. But need standards and not just guidelines.
- ✓ Developers will max. out
- ✓ We have a chance to de-code
- ✓ State highway- bypass?
- ✓ INFRASTRUCTURE
- ✓ Traffic
- ✓ 1986-87 Ramona went through design guideline exercise
- ✓ Specifics save time and help assure retention of character
- ✓ Density
- ✓ 2001 affirmed a moratorium
- ✓ You can enforce standards by law
- ✓ Need to be penalties, etc. in 20/20
- ✓ Lot-by-lot plan?
- ✓ Shade trees
- ✓ "Smart Growth" inevitable?
- ✓ Zoning changing?
- ✓ Have managed growth
- ✓ ½ plan is traffic
- ✓ Zoning and land use
- ✓ "Openness" should be retained
- ✓ Low income in this community can be ranch-hand and second units (Maybe... depends on state)